

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 9, 15, 21, 22, and 23 are amended herein. New claim 24 is added herein. Support for new claim 24 may be found in the claims as filed originally. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the claims as originally filed, as well as in the last paragraph at page 10 of the specification.

This amendment is believed to place the application in condition for allowance, and entry of this amendment is requested respectfully. In the alternative, entry of this amendment is requested as reducing materially the issues outstanding for purposes of an Appeal. Further reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Response to Arguments:

The Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the consideration of their arguments. The Applicants, however, were disappointed to find their arguments were not persuasive, and must continue to insist that, even if Sugimoto taught “wherein the information selection means selects the advertisement information from the plurality of advertisement information,” Sugimoto still would not teach inputting or selecting based on the preference trends of the addressee at all.

In Sugimoto, rather, the *sender* selects the gift, not the recipient. The sender, for example, may be an insensitive person who has no understanding of what the recipient actually likes at all. In that case, the things the sender *thinks* the recipient might like may well bear no correlation to the preference trends of the recipient at all, and may actually *offend* the recipient, driving them to break off all further contact with the sender. That would be bad. This is to be contrasted with claim 1, which recites, “first preference trend input means for inputting preference trends of said *addressee*.” Further reconsideration is therefore requested respectfully.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Sugimoto et al. JP 11-242714 (hereinafter “Sugimoto”). The rejection is traversed to the extent it would apply to the claims as amended.

In the claimed invention, in contrast to Sugimoto, a prospective addressee is determined preliminarily by the advertisement provider for presentation to the card-sending client, upon selection of suitable advertising information. The card-sending client, then, is presented with or indicated a plurality of advertising information which might be appropriate and selects one of them to forward to the addressee. Thus, the card-sending client finally selects one of the

advertisements from the plurality of advertising information, which has been adapted to the addressee assumed by the advertisement provider. Several examples of the addressee, i.e. the providing target, are described in the last paragraph at page 10 of the specification.

Thus, in the claimed invention, an advertisement provider can provide the advertisements to a targeted market. Furthermore, the addressee has an improved opportunity to be sent information which is suitable for their preferences. In Sugimoto, in contrast, no providing target is specified for the selection of the advertisement information.

Claim 1, in particular, recites,

“wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information.”

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information,” as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 recites further,

“wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection.”

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection,” as recited in claim 1.

Finally, claim 1 recites,

“selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee.”

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee,” as recited in claim 1. Sugimoto, rather, pays no attention to what the preference trends of the addressee might be at all, let alone selects advertising information based upon them. In particular, as Sugimoto describes the Problem to be Solved,

To enable a new type of advertisement, which is called solicited and, by sending a receiver an electronic greeting card and automatically inputting both a sender and the receiver to lottery about a free gift selected by the sender.

Thus, in Sugimoto a free gift is selected by the *sender*, not “selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee,” as recited in claim 1. There

may be no correlation at all between what the sender thinks the addressee might like and the actual preferences of the addressee.

Furthermore, as Sugimoto describes the Solution,

Since a sender generates an electronic greeting card, sends it and selects a free gift that can be acquired by the sender and his receiver as a team, one among plural 'courses' corresponding to each advertisement company can be picked up (S302).

Thus, in Sugimoto, the *sender* selects the free gift, not "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as recited in claim 1. There may be no correlation at all between what the sender thinks the addressee might like and the actual preferences of the addressee.

Furthermore, as Sugimoto also describes in the Solution,

The sender selects a free gift (S304).

Thus, in Sugimoto, the *sender* selects the free gift, not "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as recited in claim 1. There may be no correlation at all between what the sender thinks the addressee might like and the actual preferences of the addressee.

Furthermore, as Sugimoto also describes in the Solution,

The free gift can or can not be acquired by the sender and the receiver as the team.

Thus, in Sugimoto, since the free gift might be acquired by both the sender and the receiver, as the team, the sender's personal gift preferences will surely take precedence over whatever the sender might think the receiver might like with respect to the nature of the gift. This is to be contrasted with claim 1, which recites, "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee."

Finally, as Sugimoto also describes in the Solution,

The sender is requested to fill out a questionnaire before sending a 1st greeting card of a specific course in the process of generating an electronic greeting card (S306).

Since, in Sugimoto, the sender is filling out the questionnaire, Sugimoto is not, "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 2-7 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-7 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 8:

Claim 8 recites,

“wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information.”

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 8 recites further,

“wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection.”

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 8 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 9-14:

Claim 9 recites,

“wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information.”

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 9 recites further,

“wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection.”

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “wherein the plurality of

advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Finally, claim 9 recites,

"selecting advertisement information suitable for the input preference trends of said addressee."

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of said card sending client," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 9 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 10-14 depend from claim 9 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 10-14 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-14 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 15-20:

Claim 15 recites,

"wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information."

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 15 recites further,

"wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection."

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Finally, claim 15 recites,

"selecting advertisement information suitable for the input preference trends of said addressee."

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "selecting advertisement information

suitable for the input preference trends of said addressee," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 15 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 16-20 depend from claim 15 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 16-20 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16-20 is also earnestly solicited.

Claim 21:

Claim 21 recites,

"wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information."

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 21 recites further,

"wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection."

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Finally, claim 21 recites,

"to select advertisement information to fit the preference trends of the addressee."

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "to select advertisement information to fit the preference trends of the addressee," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 21 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 22:

Claim 22 recites,

"wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider

upon selection of the advertisement information.”

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 22 recites further,

“wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection.”

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Finally, claim 22 recites,

“selecting first advertisement information to fit the input preference trends of said addressee.”

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests “selecting first advertisement information to fit the input preference trends of said addressee,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 22 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 23:

Claim 23 recites,

“wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information.”

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “wherein the addressee has been preliminarily determined by the advertisement provider upon selection of the advertisement information,” as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 23 recites further,

“wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee for the selection.”

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the

addressee for the selection," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Finally, claim 23 recites,

"selecting advertisement information to fit the input preference trends of said addressee."

Sugimoto neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "selecting advertisement information to fit the input preference trends of said addressee," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 23 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 is earnestly solicited.

New Claim 24:

Claim 24 recites,

"inputting preference trends of an addressee."

None of the cited references teach, disclose, or suggest "inputting preference trends of an addressee," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 24 is thus believed to be allowable.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1-24 are allowable over the cited references. If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

280C05

By:


Thomas E. McKierhan
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501